



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,440	08/08/2001	Hideki Matsunaga	110331	9076
25944	7590	06/26/2006	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320				LY, ANH
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2162		

DATE MAILED: 06/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/923,440	MATSUNAGA, HIDEKI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Anh Ly	2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is response to Applicant's AMENDMENT filed on 03/30/2006.
2. Claims 1-18 are pending in this application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear that what the "retrieval condition", "attribute of the object" and "identifier" in the claims are. Applicant is advised to amend the claim to clarify these terms for their intended use. Applicant is reminded that no new matter should be added.

***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 1 and 10 are objected to because of the following informalities: Because "the object matching" is not clearly is that it is "when matching or upon matching". Appropriate corrections are required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because Claims 1 and 10 are lacking of useful tangible result. It is not a “real world” result. The real world result is not the steps or process or structure used to produce the result. The claim languages are missing the steps for manipulating or how to handle the matched object (for example, after defining, setting and performing access right and access control, the desired or retrievable or accessible or stored document(s) is/are being displayed or presented to the user(s). It is a tangible result).

***Priority***

6. Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) prior to declaration of an interference, **a translation of the foreign application should be submitted under 37 CFR 1.55 in reply to this action.**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No.: US 2002/0120858 A1 of PORTER et al. (hereinafter Porter) in view of Patent No.: US 5,926,824 issued to Hashimoto.

With respect to claim 1, Porter teaches an object management method for performing access control for a stored object (a method and apparatus for stored document in the database and performing access control on the security information of the stored document with permission rights to access the stored document: fig. 1, section 0006), the method comprising the steps of:

setting an access right in association with the retrieval condition (access control to the stored document based on the users' access right (permission rights to access stored document) for a particular document's attribute (sections 0006-0007 and 0061; also see fig. 7 and section 0075; the attributes of the document including its title, author, and the date saved: sections 0005, 0034 and 0057);

setting an identifier for identifying the object (document identifier for identifying the document: section 0082); and

performing access control for the object matching the retrieval condition and the identifier on the basis of the access right (access control is performed based on the users' permission rights to access the document; also based on the ACL, which is created via access control entries including the level security and level of access of each user to the document: sections 0006 and 0075).

Porter teaches setting access right or permission rights to access the document based on the attribute of document such as the attributes of the document including its

title, author, and the date saved; defining identifier for identifying the document and performing access control for the document based on the level of access to the stored document. Porter does not clearly teach defining a retrieval condition for retrieving an object, the retrieval condition being defined based on at least one attribute of the object.

However, Hashimoto teaches setting retrieval condition to retrieve a text or document and setting retrieval condition by document attributes such as document name, document creation date, document creator (figs. 6 & 10, col. 5, lines 55-67, and col. 6, lines 1-8 and col. 8, lines 1-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Porter with the teachings of Hashimoto. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of setting retrieval condition for retrieving an object stored in the database based on the attribute of the stored object as disclosed (Hashimoto's fig. 10), into the system of Porter for the purpose of having permission rights to access to the document matching the retriever's access right, thereby, helping to be easy for retrieving a document in accordance with attributes of a document construction more efficient (Hashimoto's col. 2, lines 42-45).

With respect to claims 2-3, Porter teaches a method for performing access control for a stored object as discussed in claim 1.

Porter teaches setting access right or permission rights to access the document based on the attribute of document such as the attributes of the document including its title, author, and the date saved; defining identifier for identifying the document and

performing access control for the document based on the level of access to the stored document. Porter does not clearly teach defining a retrieval condition for retrieving an object.

However, Hashimoto teaches setting retrieval condition to retrieve a text or document and setting retrieval condition by document attributes such as document name, document creation date, document creator (figs. 6 & 10, col. 5, lines 55-67, and col. 6, lines 1-8 and col. 8, lines 1-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Porter with the teachings of Hashimoto. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of setting retrieval condition for retrieving an object stored in the database based on the attribute of the stored object as disclosed (Hashimoto's fig. 10), into the system of Porter for the purpose of having permission rights to access to the document matching the retriever's access right, thereby, helping to be easy for retrieving a document in accordance with attributes of a document construction more efficient (Hashimoto's col. 2, lines 42-45).

With respect to claim 4, Porter teaches the identifier is changed according to need when addition, modification, or deletion of the object identified by the identifier is made (fig. 6, sections 0044, 0047 and 0059).

With respect to claims 5-6, Porter teaches a method for performing access control for a stored object as discussed in claim 1.

Porter teaches setting access right or permission rights to access the document based on the attribute of document such as the attributes of the document including its title, author, and the date saved; defining identifier for identifying the document and performing access control for the document based on the level of access to the stored document. Porter does not clearly teach performing access control, if the access-requested object matches a plurality of retrieval conditions, on the basis of OR of the matched retrieval conditions and performing access control, if the access-requested object matches a plurality of retrieval conditions, on the basis of AND of the matched retrieval conditions.

However, Hashimoto teaches setting retrieval condition to retrieve a text or document and performing retrieval of a document matching within the retrieval condition (figs. 10, 12 & 13, col. 8, lines 1-55 and col. 9, lines 2-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Porter with the teachings of Hashimoto. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of setting retrieval condition for retrieving an object stored in the database based on the attribute of the stored object as disclosed (Hashimoto's fig. 10), into the system of Porter for the purpose of having permission rights to access to the document matching the retriever's access right, thereby, helping to be easy for retrieving a document in accordance with attributes of a document construction more efficient (Hashimoto's col. 2, lines 42-45).

With respect to claims 7-8, Porter teaches a method for performing access control for a stored object as discussed in claim 1.

Porter teaches setting access right or permission rights to access the document based on the attribute of document such as the attributes of the document including its title, author, and the date saved; defining identifier for identifying the document and performing access control for the document based on the level of access to the stored document. Porter does not clearly teach wherein the object is stored with attribute data, and the retrieval condition aims to retrieve the object on the basis of the attribute data, and wherein the object is stored with attribute data and a method for referring to an entity of the object, and the retrieval condition aims to retrieve the object on the basis of the attribute data and the entity of the object referred to by the method.

However, Hashimoto teaches retrieving the object based on the stored object with attribute data to the retrieval condition (fig. 12, and col. 8, lines 40-67 and col. 9, lines 1-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Porter with the teachings of Hashimoto. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of setting retrieval condition for retrieving an object stored in the database based on the attribute of the stored object as disclosed (Hashimoto's fig. 10), into the system of Porter for the purpose of having permission rights to access to the document matching the retriever's access right, thereby, helping to be easy for retrieving a

document in accordance with attributes of a document construction more efficient (Hashimoto's col. 2, lines 42-45).

With respect to claim 9, Porter teaches wherein the access right is a specification about a user and an access type allowed to access the object (fig. 1, sections 0006, 0009, 0061 and 0075).

Claim 10 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 11 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claim 12 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 13 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 14 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 15 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

Claim 16 is essentially the same as claim 7 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 7 hereinabove.

Claim 17 is essentially the same as claim 8 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 8 hereinabove.

Claim 18 is essentially the same as claim 9 except that it is directed to a system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 9 hereinabove.

### Contact Information

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: **ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV** (**Written Authorization being given by Applicant (MPEP 502.03 [R-2]) or fax to (571) 273-4039 (Examiner's personal Fax No.)**). The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or **Primary Examiner: Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: **Central Fax Center: (571) 273-8300**

ANH LY  
JUN. 20<sup>th</sup>, 2006



JEAN M. CORRIELUS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER